

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, and reconsideration of the Office Action of July 14, 2004. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-3 and 5-8 will remain pending in this application. The changes to claims 1 and 8 are fully supported by the specification and original claims. For example, the changes to claim 1 are supported by at least Figure 18. Hence, no new matter is incorporated by this Amendment.

Applicants note the comments in the Office Action concerning the priority document. Accordingly, Applicants file herewith a certified copy of priority document 2000-097,136.

* * * * *

The drawings are objected to because Figures 2 and 3 are considered to lack the designation --Prior Art--. In response, Applicants submit herewith a Letter With Formal Drawings and an amended version of each of Figures 2 and 3. The amended versions of Figure 2 and 3 both include the --Prior Art-- designation.

* * *

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as purportedly indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse.

In preparing this Amendment, Applicants have carefully reviewed the claims, taking into consideration the various issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action. In general, the claims have been amended in a manner to address the Examiner's concerns regarding clarity as set forth in the Office Action. In particular, claim 1 has

been amended to ensure proper antecedent basis for each feature and to recite "depending on the instruction received when" as suggested by the Examiner.

With respect to claim 3, Applicants respectfully submit that the metes and bounds of this claim would be clear to those of ordinary skill. Claim 3 describes how the control information is set in the setting means. Hence, Applicant have not amended claim 3.

Claim 6 has been amended by removing the terminology "all or a part of." Furthermore, claim 8 has been rewritten to recite a computer-readable medium.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

* * *

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended claim 8 in a manner that overcomes this rejection. Specifically, claims 8 has been amended to recite "A computer-readable medium." Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

* * *

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly obvious based on Edson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,526,582) in view of Daniels (U.S. 2002/0032907). Applicants again respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1, from which claims 2-8 all depend, concerns a gateway apparatus connected to a first and a second network. The gateway apparatus controls the operation of an apparatus or a plurality of apparatuses connected to the first network, depending on instructions directed to the second network, by an instructing apparatus connected to the first network. The gateway apparatus includes monitoring means, control signal outputting means, and identification information storing means. The information stored by identification information means identifies each apparatus. It also

identifies the functions performable by each apparatus, and gives a description of each such function. The control signal outputting means outputs control signals by using such identification information stored in the identification information storing means.

Figure 5 shows a configuration diagram of the gateway apparatus according to one of Applicants' exemplary embodiments. As shown in Figure 5, an information identification information storing means (i.e. electronic device identification information table) appears as reference 205. Figure 18 illustrates exemplary identification information of the type stored by means 205. There is a (device-proper) control code that operates the controlled device along with a control command description. Neither Edson nor Daniels teaches or fairly suggests a gateway apparatus that includes the identification information storing means and the identification information described in claim 1. Moreover, nothing in the teachings of either patent would provide sufficient motivation to have led those of ordinary skill in the art to the above features of Applicants' invention.

Claim 8 is to a medium that causes a computer to perform the defined elements of claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Edson and Daniels for the same reasons that claim 1 does.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit this rejection is overcome. Hence, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

* * * * *

Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment and the above remarks obviate all outstanding objection and rejections in this case, thereby placing the application in condition for immediate allowance. Allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

If any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 are due in connection with this filing, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300; Order No. 033216.072.

If an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is necessary that is not accounted for in the papers filed herewith, such an extension is requested. The extension fee should be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4300; Order No. 033216.072.

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By:



Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Dated: November 12, 2004